

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/175,178	10/20/1998	SARVAR PATEL	13-1	6600	
46290	7590 02/17/200	i .	EXAM	EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100			PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY		
	TX 77042		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2132		

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/175,178	PATEL ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor	2132			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	L	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is not of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ja	nuarv 2006.				
•—	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	· — .					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite atent Application (PTO-152)			
. —	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	F. F			

Application/Control Number: 09/175,178

Art Unit: 2132

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

- 1. The Applicant's arguments regarding objections to the specifications are persuasive and have been withdrawn.
- 2. The Applicant's arguments regarding 35 USC § 101 rejection of Claims 1-3 are not persuasive. As the applicant discloses the usefulness of the mathematical algorithm in wireless communications and simplifying search strings, but algorithms that are inherently useful do not constitute statutory subject matter see In Sarkar, 588 F.2d at 1335, 200 USPQ at 139. ("No mathematical equation can be used, as a practical matter, without establishing and substituting values for the variables expressed therein. Substitution of values dictated by the formula has thus been viewed as a form of mathematical step. If the steps of gathering and substituting values were alone sufficient, every mathematical equation, formula, or algorithm having any practical use would be per se subject to patenting as a "process" under 101. Consideration of whether the substitution of specific values is enough to convert the disembodied ideas present in the formula into an embodiment of those ideas, or into an application of the formula, is foreclosed by the current state of the law.") and see also MPEP § 2106 IV.B.2.ii.

Application/Control Number: 09/175,178

Art Unit: 2132

4 ~

3. The Applicant's arguments regarding 35 USC § 102(b) are not persuasive. Applicants object to rejection of claim 1-3 because prime number is above upper limit of Scheiner square hash recommendations. However, there is no rationale within specification as to why this would be a major improvement over Scheiner recommended range. Further more, such modifications of range do not imply patentability arguments over prior art. In regard to range modifications not implying patentability, please refer to In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). And further the applicant's arguments regarding not performing mod-p operation on a squared sum is not persuasive, as Scheiner discloses the squaring of H and M and then performing mod-p operation see pg 457 and also rejection below.

Page 3

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The instant claims disclose method of shortened representation of a collection of bits which represents mathematical algorithms see MPEP 2106, IV, B, 1.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Application/Control Number: 09/175,178 Page 4

Art Unit: 2132

. y .

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 7. Claim 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schenier.
- 8. Regarding Claims 1-3, Schenier discloses a hashing method of Jueneman where  $H_i = (H_{i-1} + M_i)^2 \mod p$  see Page 457, and also IBC hash discloses the additional  $h_i = ((M_i \mod p) + v) \mod 2^n$  see Page 458.

#### Conclusion

- 9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor whose telephone number is 571-272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on

Application/Control Number: 09/175,178

Art Unit: 2132

8-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor Examiner

Page 5

Art Unit 2132

V P 5/8/2006

> GILBERTO BARRON JAG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100